

CCAFS
4th INDEPENDENT SCIENCE PANEL MEETING

6-7 May, 2013
Hanoi, Vietnam

MINUTES

Participants: Thomas Rosswall (Chair)
Bruce Campbell (Program Director) (*ex officio*)
Fatima Denton
Takeshi Horie
Thierry Lebel
Holger Meinke
Charles Rice (*ex officio*, CIAT BoT)
Mary Scholes (Vice-Chair)
Lindiwe Majele Sibanda
Ram Badan Singh
Christof Walter
Steven Wilson (*ex officio*, Future Earth)

Apologies: Ariel Dinar

Invited participants: Andy Jarvis (Theme 1) (for agenda items 1-11)
Jim Hansen (Theme 2) (for agenda items 1-11)
Meryl Richards (Theme 3) (for agenda items 1-11)
Patti Kristjanson (Theme 4) (for agenda items 1-11)
Philip K. Thornton (Theme 4) (for agenda items 1-11)
James Kinyangi (East Africa) (for agenda items 1-11)
Robert Zougmore (West Africa) (for agenda items 1-11)
Pramod Aggarwal (South Asia) (for agenda items 1-11)
Ana Maria Loboguerrero (Latin America) (for agenda items 1-11)
Paul Fox (South-East Asia, Interim) (for agenda items 1-11)
Torben Timmermann, CCAFS Coordinating Unit (Secretary) (for agenda items 1-16)
Sonja Vermeulen, CCAFS Coordinating Unit (for agenda items 1-11)
Gloria Rengifo, CCAFS Coordinating Unit (for agenda items 1-11)

1) Welcome by the Chair and announcements

The Chair opened the meeting, welcomed the participants and noted the apologies. He welcomed the two new *ex officio* members, Charles Rice, representing the CIAT Board of Trustees, and Steven Wilson, representing Future Earth. He also welcomed the Regional Program Leader for Latin America, Ana Maria Loboguerrero, and the interim Regional Program Leader for Southeast Asia, Paul Fox, whom the Chair also thanked for organizing the successful field trip on 5 May. He noted that one Theme Leader, Lini Wollenberg, had excused herself from this ISP for very important personal reasons. She was replaced by Theme 3 Science Officer, Meryl Richards. The Chair also used the opportunity to urge the members to read carefully the Program Director's monthly e-bulletin which contains important updates on CCAFS science as well as administrative issues and events. Torben Timmermann provided practical information.

2) Agenda, minutes and matters arising

2.1 Adoption of agenda

The Chair invited the members to review the agenda and suggest any additional issues that might be discussed under agenda item #16 Any other business. He noted that members have been asked for guidance in advance on items that they wish to see discussed.

The Chair asked that CCAFS ISP members voluntarily and openly declare any conflict of interest and that in such cases they would be excused from the particular discussion. He also suggested that it is opportune for the ISP to have an ISP conflict of interest policy established. The Chair reiterated that CCAFS and FANRPAN in September 2012 have engaged in a capacity enhancement collaboration during 2012 and 2013 to support African engagement in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) COP18 and COP19 after an open tender procedure. In addition, CCAFS was invited by FANRPAN to join a consortium for an Africa-focused project on climate change and agriculture. CCAFS accepted the invitation and have helped develop the concept note to be submitted to the Canadian International Development Research Centre (IDRC).

Decisions:

- To adopt the agenda after any additions to agenda item #16.
- To request the Program Director to prepare a draft conflict of interest policy statement for the ISP for its next meeting.

2.2 Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising

The Chair noted that the minutes were approved following an email consultation with the ISP in the weeks after the 3rd ISP meeting. The approved minutes have been placed on the CCAFS website.

The Program Director elaborated on matters arising:

Matters arising are being dealt with in the substantive agenda items for the current meeting. However, a large number of topics were suggested for attention at future meetings, and in addition, there are new topics needing attention. To help plan for future meetings, these have been collected

under agenda item #11 so as to prioritise and select those for discussion at the next ISP meeting(s).

Meeting 3, Item 3.1: CCAFS and “food security”

CCAFS was asked to coordinate with the “productivity” CGIAR Research Programs (CRP3) by initiating activities with several of the CRP3s in early 2013. CCAFS has invited all crop-focused CRPs to participate in and contribute to an initiative on Target Population of Environments (TPEs, a set of environments to which the improved crop varieties developed by breeding programs need to be adapted) analysis under current and future climate conditions. A workshop, to be held at in the Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation (EMBRAPA) in June, plans on establishing a joint set of activities whereby CCAFS supports the commodity programs through climate information services for setting breeding priorities.

CCAFS was also asked to engage in discussions with the CRP on Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (CRP4) and the CRP on Water, Land and Ecosystems (CRP5). Possible collaboration was discussed with CRP4 leadership. It was agreed that there was not a huge scope for proactive collaboration, though there were opportunities and willingness to respond to specific requests and opportunities (like events, joint publications and media). CRP4 is focusing on development of value chains for high-value agricultural products.

There are many more opportunities for collaboration with CRP5. CCAFS, CRP5 and CRP6 (Forests, Trees and Agroforestry) will host a joint planning meeting in Bonn on 6-7th June at which 5-6 persons from the management teams of the CRPs will discuss concrete ways forward.

The ISP further asked the CCAFS Program Management Committee (PMC) to consider how transformative change can be addressed. Through a collaboration with the Australian Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO), three members of CCAFS management team participated in a joint workshop in Brisbane in late April to set out a framework for tackling transformative adaptation.

Meeting 3, Item 3.3: Theme 2 activities in West Africa

The ISP requested that contacts should be established with the Africa Monsoon Multidisciplinary Analysis (AMMA) project at the highest level to avoid redundant activities and to define complementary research. At the regional level, Robert Zougmore has discussed with the Scientific Coordinator for Centre Regional de Formation et d'Application en Agrométéorologie et Hydrologie Opérationnelle (AGRHYMET), a common partner for CCAFS and AMMA in West Africa, to make sure that synergies are achieved for activities supported by CCAFS and AMMA. At the global level, Jim Hansen has reached out to AMMA leadership and a meeting would be organized in the coming months.

Meeting 3, Item 3.4: Strategies in place for Linking Knowledge with Action

The CCAFS Coordinating Unit was asked to increase its activities with Regional Program Leaders, even if this meant downscaling global engagement and communication. For 2013 the following

main activities are the focus of co-planning. In East and West Africa the main focus is on the development of National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) linked to CAADP – the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme. Policy makers in the CCAFS countries in the two regions are in the early stages of developing NAPs. The major CCAFS efforts will most likely take place in relation to Kenya and Mali. For South Asia two campaigns are being considered, which both have potential for a field visit attracting regional and global media: one is a visit to a climate-smart village, and the other is a potential visit to see how index-insurance is benefiting farmers in India (depending on whether the insurance product is finalized and accepted by the insurance company).

Meeting 3, Item 4: Monitoring and evaluation strategy

CCAFS was asked to interact with the CGIAR/ISPC Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) to consider further work on impact assessments of institutional changes and policies at national and global levels. Andy Jarvis attended the latest SPIA meeting in March, where it was indicated that there would be a special SPIA effort in this regard, with a call for proposals to do a case study and develop the methods. CCAFS will apply to do one of the case studies. The PMC was also requested to consider approaches to evaluate the outcomes reported by Centers, Regions and Themes. For 2012 all outcome statements were evaluated by the Program Director, one Theme Leader and by an independent consultant. CCAFS will use the SPIA opportunity to develop the methods for future evaluations.

Meeting 3, Item 8.1: Business Plan and budget 2013, overall issues

The ISP expressed the need to rethink the strategy within Theme 4. Given the major changes likely to occur in 2014, when CCAFS has to prepare a new proposal, the Chair agreed with the Program Director that this item would be dropped from the current ISP agenda. The changes going forward are discussed under agenda item# 5.

European Commission review of CCAFS

The European Commission (EC) conducted a review of CCAFS in the last half of 2012 and CCAFS was promised the final report last year. A draft report was sent to the Program Director in late 2012, and most of the recommendations and conclusions reflect a very positive review for CCAFS. Unfortunately, the final report has not yet been received, so a response to the recommendations has not been initiated.

Decisions:

- To note that the minutes have been approved by the ISP via email consultation.
- To note the progress on matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.
- To request that ISP members receive copies of the EC review as soon as it is received, and that the PMC report on the follow-up actions from that and the governance and management review be presented at the next ISP meeting.

3) Chair's report from the CIAT Board of Trustees meeting in November

The Chair said that normally, the Program Director attends the CIAT BoT meeting in the first half of each year, which focuses on programmatic issues, and the Chair attends the meeting in the second half of the year. For the BoT meeting in November 2012 meeting, the Chair was present and the Program Director made a report via teleconference link.

The Chair reported to the CIAT Board of Trustees (CIAT BoT) on: (a) reflections from the 3rd ISP meeting; (b) recommendations on topics for the first external, programmatic review; (c) Business Plan 2013; and (d) budget 2013. The recommendations from the ISP were approved without changes. One question related to the role of ESSP/Future Earth in the governance of CCAFS, and this was explained. The title for the external evaluation on the theme by region matrix was requested to be changed so a clear link to CCAFS could be seen. The CIAT BoT requested more focus on outcomes and deliverables in the future presentations by the Program Director to the BoT. The BoT Chair expressed the appreciation of the BoT and asked how they could further support CCAFS. The CIAT Director General expressed appreciation for the work of the CCAFS Program Director and ISP Chair, for maintaining excellent working relationships with CIAT structures.

Decisions:

- To note the Chair's report and the continuing excellent relationship between the CIAT BoT and the CCAFS ISP.

4) Assessment of 2012 achievements

The Program Director elaborated on the CCAFS 2012 annual report to the Consortium. As was clear, there had been many positive achievements. The attention of the ISP was drawn to the many outcomes reported, the flagship products and tools produced, the preparation of the gender strategy and its initial implementation, the good use of CCAFS open-access data bases and the positive feedback on the partnership survey.

The main risks are similar to those reported last year:

(a) Funding uncertainty. The funding freeze put a hold on some implementation and resulted in some under spending (reflected in high commitments) but in general the situation has improved on 2011. CCAFS is, however, still not in a position to do a lot of advanced planning, as budget allocations for subsequent years do not come very early.

(b) The lack of strategic focus of some Center activities. This has also improved on 2011, and only 3% of proposed Center Activities were rated as not strategic. It is planned that the new Intermediate Development Outcome (IDO) system (see agenda item #5) will ensure further strategic focus.

(c) Lack of capacity to attract donors to build up bilateral funding and/or Centers not allocating bilateral funds to CCAFS. This was 35% in 2011, and only 26% in 2012. Fortunately, 40% is projected for 2013, but we have to see if this materialises. The Program Director has prepared a fund-raising strategy and has embarked on its implementation.

Perhaps one of the greatest risks that requires careful consideration relates to the recently announced process for a “phase 2” of CRPs, including getting greater coherence in the entire CGIAR research portfolio – see agenda item #5. The potential risk relates to the Consortium and Fund Council using this as an opportunity to change directions and re-think the budget allocation amongst CRPs in lieu of new priorities.

Four other issues were noted in the 2012 annual report:

- (a) Relatively low numbers of publications (77) for a program of this size.¹ This has been communicated to Program Participants at the annual CCAFS retreat and means of improving production of papers were discussed.
- (b) Relatively low percentage of products/tools/technologies that have been assessed for their gender-differentiated effects or which consider gender. CCAFS will have to provide additional incentives for Centers to ensure that gender dimensions are included and assessed, including giving greater weight to gender in the CCAFS performance management system.
- (c) Limited inter-Center work at CCAFS sites. While inter-Center work has increased markedly, we note that it is still a struggle to get Centers to work in an integrated manner within CCAFS sites. CCAFS plans to use the new IDO system to get greater integration and more focus within regions.
- (d) On-going reform in the global environmental change community. Future Earth is yet to get up and running, while at the same time the CGIAR is about to go through a new period of reform and planning. It will be paramount to build good partnerships in this second phase of CRPs. CCAFS proposes a stocktaking and further planning of the partnership in late 2013.

In addition, it is apparent that the CGIAR will not get international status in Denmark and thus CIAT has begun investigating alternative locations for the Coordinating Unit.

A number of important issues were raised by members:

- In terms of communications it is important to link the work to the CCAFS outcomes in order to ensure that the work on communication reflects the strategic priorities.
- It is important to strive for high-profile and breakthrough publications as opposed to a focus on publication quantity. The large number of technical reports relative to scientific papers was also questioned.
- A system of tracking citations of CCAFS publications should be established.
- The structure of publications on the website should be simplified and should be key word searchable.
- Indicators for program success should be defined and formalized.

¹ This count is based on articles in the ISI Thompson list, the standard that the CGIAR uses.

- There appears to be some lack of integration of activities at site level. This needs to be rectified.
- It is accepted that some activities are conducted outside CCAFS regions, if they are important and are being implemented by key partners.
- Consultation with Future Earth should be stepped up to determine future collaboration.
- An update on how the Commission work has been used is needed. It was mentioned that this update is in progress.

Decisions:

- To note the good progress of CCAFS in 2012.
- To ensure that by 2014 all Center activities under CCAFS are strategic and aligned with the Intermediate Development Outcomes.
- To support the proposed follow-up actions on the problems and concerns raised, including a stocktaking of the CGIAR-global change research partnership in late 2013. It is suggested that CCAFS contribute to an initiative to bring food security issues together in a global context within Future Earth. Further initiatives to strengthen CCAFS-Future Earth collaboration in an African context should also be considered. The PMC is urged to ensure pro-active follow-up with Future Earth.

5) Proposed new procedures in the CGIAR – Phase 2 of CCAFS

The Program Director informed the ISP that a second round of CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs) will be established and funded under a new process. This is expected to be approved by the Fund Council in late 2013.

End/start date

While CCAFS and the CGIAR Research Program on Rice (GRiSP) have an agreed program plan for five years, other CRPs are only approved for three years. Thus, CCAFS will be asked to terminate after four years (end 2014), in order to start a new round of CRPs in 2015, with all programs starting at the same time. This would mean that the current program plan would not be fully implemented, including the initially proposed five-year evaluation, though CCAFS may still be evaluated in some form or another, and potentially in 2014.

Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs)

In 2013, CRPs are asked to develop IDOs together with an associated theory of change. The IDOs will need to be expressed as development targets to be achieved by 2023, together with the budget needed to achieve the target (the 2023 target is based on a nine-year program – 2015-2023 – that is based on three phases of three years each, with some kind of evaluation after each three year phase). The theory of change reflects how the research process and products are going to help achieve development targets (IDOs) and how those targets link to the System Level Outcomes (SLOs). Targets are to be negotiated with partners and donors, and a key meeting in this regard will take place on 20-21 June in Montpellier, where initial targets are to

be negotiated amongst CRP leaders, partners and funders. CCAFS is in good shape as it has been doing outcome mapping with Center Contact Points in regions and at sites.

New concept note

CCAFS will be asked to produce a new concept note for the second phase by early 2014, in line with the IDOs developed and taking into account what has not worked till now (e.g., definition of boundaries of each CRP to avoid future overlaps). Concept notes will be 10 pages maximum and only cover the theory of change, including the CRP's comparative advantage internationally; impact pathway; IDOs at program level by end of 2023; partnerships and the role of partners; headline budget and value for money.

New full proposal

After the concept note is approved, CCAFS will be asked to prepare a full proposal. This will be 40 pages max and also contain a set of "flagship products" (various terms are currently being used by the Consortium, including also themes, components and "big projects"). These will be the large building blocks for the CRP, each with their own IDOs, key activities, partners and budgets of 3-year, or possibly 6-year, duration. The draft flagship products also need to be shared at the above-mentioned meeting in Montpellier.

Changes to the CRP portfolio

It is planned that there is a portfolio level review that analyses which programs are doing well and which ones are struggling. Ideally the call for new proposals is the moment to determine whether programs need to continue, need to be closed down, or need to be re-focused or possibly require a change in management.

Possible new areas for CRPs could emerge. One of these relates to mitigation in agriculture. CCAFS has been asked to engage an independent consultant or team to analyze the role of mitigation in agriculture and whether this is sufficiently important to justify a new research program, or strengthening CCAFS or mainstreaming mitigation throughout the CRP portfolio.

Follow up actions

In relation to the need for a new proposal, an outline draft proposal for IDOs and flagship products was presented. The PMC expects to present a more advanced version at the October ISP meeting. However, the PMC needs to have a draft version ready for sharing with partners and funders at the above-mentioned meeting in June. It was noted that the organizational structure of CCAFS could potentially change as a result of the proposed directions in phase 2 and as a result of the governance reviews being conducted by the CGIAR Consortium and through the CIAT internally commissioned external review.

Decisions:

- To note the discussion on the proposed IDOs and themes for phase 2 of CCAFS.

- To underline the importance of linking mitigation and adaptation in relation to agriculture, food security and climate change.
- To note that the use of the term “flagship products” is confusing, and to urge the PMC, in discussions with the Consortium, to define “products” in a fashion which targets specific audiences.
- To request that ISP be provided the possibility to comment on the CCAFS input to the CGIAR June Montpellier meeting, with ISP members ensuring quick turnaround and feedback to the Program Director.
- Theme 4 to consult with Karen O’Brien at University of Oslo/Future Earth on the Theory of Change.

6) Thematic CCAFS issues

6.1 Managing climate risk through food delivery, trade and crisis response

CCAFS Objective 2.2. was discussed. Agricultural development and food security crisis response represent different parts of a continuum of variability and risk management, but involve distinct sets of institutions and policies. Building resilience to climate variability requires a more unified approach, and expanded engagement of food security decision-makers. CCAFS Objective 2.2 focuses on improving food system decisions in the face of climate-induced production and price shocks. The strategy targets improving four areas of food system decision-making: a) food security humanitarian response; b) national food security planning and disaster risk reduction investments; c) national social protection policies; and d) food trade and price volatility management. CCAFS research seeks to contribute to these four areas of decision-making through a) improvements to information on impacts of climate fluctuations on food security, and b) analyses and development of evidence to support improved decision-making.

Ongoing work includes: (a) analysis of decision-making processes in Ethiopia and targeting new sources of information for annual planning and budgets; (b) engagement with the IPC (Integrated Phase Classification system²) to incorporate climate information into national food security analysis and response options; (c) analysis of social protection schemes and "stress testing" their effectiveness/cost by including climate variability (UNDP); (d) bringing climate information into food security analyses, atlases and decision tools; and (e) preparations for integrating climate, production, price and household food security modeling to strengthen food security early warning.

The work benefits from a dedicated person (Michael Sheinkman, IRRI-Bangkok) with a deep understanding of food security information. The Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) process provides a common language for food security decision-making, and an entry point for relevant

² The Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC), also known as IPC scale, is a tool for improving food security analysis and decision-making. It is a standardized scale that integrates food security, nutrition and livelihood information into a statement about the nature and severity of a crisis and implications for strategic response (FAO/NGOs/WFP/National Governments).

decision-makers particularly in Asia. Work in Ethiopia shows promise for influencing sub-national government processes in food-insecure countries. The key challenge is in mobilizing a critical mass of research within Centers. Objective 2.2 represents a significant expansion beyond the CGIAR's traditional focus. Beyond a relatively small group of IFPRI scientists, there is wealth of potentially relevant expertise in the CGIAR that does not effectively connect with the food security and food system communities. Defining and communicating the CGIAR's potential contribution, and fostering interest in partnership with the CGIAR are a related challenge.

Three main points were highlighted. The first point was that CCAFS is seen as focusing largely on the production side of food security - the historic emphasis of the CGIAR - but needs to also address the accessibility and utilization dimensions of food security. Second, several members suggested that CCAFS should look more outside than inside the CGIAR for relevant expertise. Suggestions were offered about additional types of relevant expertise, including disaster risk reduction and political economy. The third issue that ISP members emphasized was the importance of embedding Theme 2 research on food security decision-making in the face of climate shocks, into the regional partnership and advocacy strategy, and work through existing processes that increase the prospects of influencing national and subnational policy.

Decisions:

- To endorse the CCAFS Objective 2.2 focus and strategy for improving food system decisions in the face of climate-induced production and price shocks.
- To underline the importance of clearly identifying the niche for CCAFS, and to assess additional partnerships that can complement traditional competencies of CGIAR in generating and amplifying key research findings and increasing potential for policy influence and uptake.
- To stress the need for building strategic partnerships and achieving scale of CCAFS findings at national, regional and global levels for greater policy impact.

6.2 Modeling effort within CCAFS

Over the past 3 years, modeling has been an integral part of the work of CCAFS. So this was a good time to reflect on the approach being taken, and endorse it noting any adjustments deemed necessary by the ISP. The approach with respect to modeling has consisted of:

- Stocktaking of models available: their strengths, weaknesses and potential gaps which need filling (under CCAFS Theme 4 leadership).
- Use and choice of models on a demand driven basis, using the most appropriate model for the problem at hand (all Themes).
- Strategically filling modeling gaps when identified, ensuring sustainability in the maintenance of the model.

CCAFS has participated in a wide array of modeling efforts, through a partnership approach. CCAFS has also had close interaction with the AgMIP project³, including participation in the steering committee, joint activities, Center leadership of components of AgMIP (e.g. AgMIP wheat with CIMMYT); and more recently with the CCAFS Regional Agricultural Forecasting Toolbox (CRAFT) to build on AgMIP's investment in crop model interoperability.

CCAFS does not develop its own models; instead it facilitates model improvement and appropriate use within the CGIAR and, in collaboration with AgMIP, outside of it. The PMC believes the approach is valid and should be maintained.

The PMC also sees some exciting opportunities for strengthening as we move forward:

Integrating seamlessly between spatial scales: Whilst most models are targeted at a single spatial scale, CCAFS has a comparative advantage to explore cross-scale linkages and understand interactions between model outputs. The scenarios work in the regions is now exploring this fully, combining GLOBIOM⁴ and IMPACT⁵ outputs with modeling at national and household scales. This is potentially a key science area moving forward, which can address head-on the trade-offs and synergies component of CCAFS.

Integrating seamlessly between temporal scales: Models are potentially the most appropriate means of exploring the linkage between risk management and longer-term adaptation. Seamless application of household models with robust decadal projections could be an exciting area of science which is largely untapped at the moment. This area will be further explored as the household modeling work progresses.

The importance of keeping such high science topics in the new portfolio of research to be undertaken by CCAFS in the second phase of the CRPs was highlighted. Discussion focused on two major aspects. Firstly, the balance between regional specific tools and global tools was discussed, and that it is important that regional needs filter up to the global levels, and vice versa. It was also noted that CCAFS should make a strong push to ensure that developing country partners are involved in model development and evaluation, and not just as end-users in a training session. The second area of discussion was with respect to climate projections and

³ The AgMIP (Agricultural Model Intercomparison and Improvement Project) Mission is: To substantially improve the characterization of world food security as affected by climate variability and change, and to enhance adaptation capacity in both developing and developed countries.

⁴ IASA's GLOBIOM model is used to analyze the competition for land use between agriculture, forestry, and bioenergy, which are the main land-based production sectors. As such, the model can provide scientists and policymakers with the means to assess, on a global basis, the rational production of food, forest fiber, and bio-fuels, all of which are vital for human welfare.

⁵ The IFPRI IMPACT model is designed to examine alternative futures for global food supply, demand, trade, prices, and food security.

uncertainties, and how CCAFS has an important role to play in terms of advising the climate prediction community of the needs for climate information for agricultural impact studies, and region specific assessments of GCM/RCM quality and critical areas for improvement if it is to be used in agricultural application.

Decisions:

- To endorse approaches being taken by CCAFS with regard to modeling.
- To note the importance of ensuring the link to development outcomes, agricultural practice and decision making capabilities focusing on relevant scales and partnerships, and where progress can be made in a timely fashion.

Within these frames:

- To contribute and encourage relevant climate modeling efforts – especially within the context of the World Climate Research Program (WCRP).
- To note that ongoing research on decision-making under uncertainty is needed.
- To identify key modeling issues for each region.

6.3 Farmer participatory research in CCAFS

CCAFS has attempted to concentrate its activities in the field at a few sites. In these sites, baseline surveys are conducted and the implementation approach is coined “climate-smart villages”, where integrated action research is conducted.

After two years using this approach it is time to review if CCAFS is on right track and identify opportunities for changing the current model. In general there is good appreciation of the climate-smart village concept as a model for field action research that can integrate knowledge across all four CCAFS Themes. There have been several challenges in implementing action research at CCAFS sites in the sampling frames. CGIAR Centers have been reluctant, often rightly so, to drop their on-going work at their historical sites where they often have rich experience. Centers have been brought together to work at common sites by providing extra funding for their participation by the CCAFS Regional Program Leaders. For example in the Bihar site of South Asia, funds were initially provided to IFPRI, Bioversity, CIMMYT, and IWMI by the Regional Program Leader to work together. Here, IFPRI is prioritising adaptation and mitigation options using choice experiments with farmers. IWMI is addressing the issues of seasonal waterlogging through vertical drains. CIMMYT is providing a knowledge base for conservation agriculture based crop management technologies and precise use of fertiliser nutrients. Bioversity and CIP are evaluating crop germplasm and varieties with farmers’ direct participation. In East Africa, ICRISAT is leading the design, development and testing of seasonal weather forecasts for farm level decision making. Within the climate smart villages, they are also testing sorghum related technologies that integrate grain legumes in cereal systems. IITA is working with disaggregated groups of farmers to vision and test adaptation pathways. CIAT is rolling out a program for testing bean technologies with women groups in Uganda.

On their own, Regions are also evaluating index based insurance, information and communication technology (ICT) based dissemination of weather forecast and other value-added information, and crop diversification. Although dialogue among Centers has certainly increased due to this approach, our current model of funding, monitoring and reporting is not encouraging Centers to fully integrate. Encouragingly, Centers have now started buying in more action research by allocating some of their own CCAFS funds for this and also involving other CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs). The other challenge relates to with regional coordination at the sites. While some tools/processes such as analogue based farmer learning have been tested by the CCAFS Themes in the Regions, and there has been some support for capacity enhancement in the region, there is a need for more focused tools/techniques/approaches in the Regions, to be provided by Theme Leaders.

CCAFS may also be missing opportunities for strengthening impact by not expanding the scope of its operations where chances of success are greater for a variety of reasons. Often, Regions/Centers/Themes have realised that there are greater chances of success/scaling out and up by working at alternative sites (e.g. where a large IFAD project is working).

Regions need to pay extra attention to ensuring that everything done at a local scale can be scaled up. We also need new mechanisms to ensure that Center work is focussed on climate-smart villages. If this is unattainable, given the constraints mentioned above (e.g. Centers already heavily invested elsewhere) and given the opportunities (e.g. large development donor initiatives that can use research inputs), then we need to reconsider how integrated work is undertaken.

Decisions:

- To note progress and suggest that CCAFS persist with a balance of activities at sites and outside sites, recognizing that working with partners outside CCAFS sites is important to ensure large scale impact.
- To request that the concept of climate-smart villages be revisited once the new Intermediate Development Outcomes are defined, as these could require re-focusing site specific efforts.
- To urge Regional Program Leaders, Theme Leaders and Centers to pay more attention to developing tools and approaches, in consultation with the farming community and other partners, for scaling out climate-smart villages/technologies to ensure that large scale impact is fostered, noting also the importance of agriculturally driven climate services.

6.4 Inter-Center collaboration

Inter-Center collaboration has progressed well under CCAFS and has now reached an optimum level that balances opportunities for synergy against transaction costs and the need to collaborate with partners beyond the CGIAR. Among the 15 Centers that participate in CCAFS, all have acceptable levels of inter-Center collaboration and five are rated as "relatively good" (based on scoring of individual Centers' 2012 technical reports by 11 members of the PMC). It

was noted, however, that at regional level there are still barriers to collaboration as indicated in the previous agenda item.

Good examples of collaboration are found in the development and use of protocols for research and analysis: in gender; in design and management of databases; in cross-disciplinary publications; and in policy-oriented events, including at the UNFCCC venue. Arguably the main constraints to inter-Center collaboration are no longer divergent Center mandates or lack of awareness about the work of other Centers, but rather issues of time and prioritization. At the level of program governance, CCAFS should continue to provide financial and non-financial incentives for Centers to collaborate on a shared agenda in which all activities and outputs contribute strategically to the overall set of agreed outcomes. The new Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs) will provide a new framework and new opportunities for inter-Center collaboration. Within this framework, the PMC should maintain inter-Center collaboration at the current optimum level by ensuring that a core set of flagship activities and outputs are supported and made visible. However, at the regional level some rethinking of the model may be necessary (as indicated in the previous agenda item).

Decisions:

- To note with great satisfaction the increased inter-Center collaboration and to ask the PMC to continue along the lines presented within the context of the IDOs and Phase 2 planning.
- To provide the necessary support and incentives as needed, to ensure that there is one or more significant inter-Center activity each year on each of the following: site-level participatory action research, gender research, capacity enhancement, publications, communications and knowledge management (including databases).

7) Capacity strengthening strategy in CCAFS

Sonja Vermeulen explained that in November 2010, CCAFS presented a capacity strengthening strategy, and this is being implemented. Capacity strengthening is also part of the annual reporting to the Consortium.

More recently, the Consortium has proposed that a capacity strengthening initiative be launched across the Consortium, in a similar manner to that on gender. The focus of the Consortium initiative is on research partners and downstream development and delivery partners such as local seed companies, or farmer organizations. CCAFS, through a staff member based at CIAT (Simone Staiger), joined the capacity strengthening working group to elaborate on the proposed initiative. Simone is currently working on a publication that will reflect CGIAR experience and lessons learned on capacity building/strengthening.

The Consortium is considering hiring a capacity strengthening advisor to develop a CGIAR wide strategy and support CRPs in developing their strategies. As part of this, the Consortium is proposing to establish a CGIAR PostDoc and Visiting Scientist program in collaboration with and co-funded by countries (e.g. Netherlands, Japan, Brazil) and research partners (e.g. CIRAD, EMBRAPA) interested in

supporting such a program.

It was suggested that CCAFS reviews its own capacity strengthening activities as soon as the Consortium plans are clearer, in order to position itself for this proposed initiative.

Decisions:

- To note the progress made on capacity strengthening.
- To ask the PMC to present new plans for capacity strengthening in phase 2 of CCAFS, taking into account the new directions that will be proposed and the Consortium initiative, and to consider partnerships with capacity strengthening organisations such as the Global change System for Analysis, Research and Training (START) and International Foundation for Science (IFS).

8) Terms of Reference for ISP-commissioned external evaluation

The Program Director explained that CCAFS must undertake at least one programmatic external review per year commissioned by the ISP. External reviews should be designed so that they can be inputs into the major evaluation that is expected to happen in Year 5, commissioned by the CGIAR Internal Evaluation Arrangement (IEA). It has been accepted that the first review will be an evaluation of how the CCAFS Theme by Region matrix is being managed to deliver on International Public Goods (IPGs: publications, databases and other knowledge products) and development outcomes.

Decisions:

- To approve the Terms of Reference (ToR) and ask the Program Director to implement the process.
- To agree that the evaluation report be presented to the ISP, together with a response by management, at its meeting in May 2014.
- To ask the PMC to identify a short list of potential evaluators for email decision by the ISP.

9) Results of the PMC self-assessment and Center feedback on the “Leadership”, “Partnership” and “Science” success factors

The Program Director said that CCAFS asked an independent consultant to assess CCAFS in terms of science, partnerships and leadership, through feedback from the management team and the CGIAR Center Contact Points. The consultant conducted a simple survey and tabulated the results. CCAFS received rather positive feedback from the Contact Points, with management generally being more critical of themselves and CCAFS than were Contact Points. Two variables appeared problematic: (a) The establishment of coherent and impact-oriented Regional Programs; (b) Transparency and clarity in relation to budgets. In addition there were a number of comments which suggested that cross-theme overlaps and synergies may be an issue (confusion as to what goes where; how to get better integration).

At the annual Contact Point retreat, there were no takers to discuss transparency issues, and so two groups were formed to discuss the other issues. It soon became apparent that while these two issues may be the most problematic in CCAFS there were no serious problems to be solved. A few minor issues were raised and some solutions proposed.

Decisions:

- To note the positive results from the survey on CCAFS performance on science, partnerships and leadership.

10) Financial related matters 2012 and 2013

10.1 2012 year-end report

Gloria Rengifo reported that CCAFS' 2012 budget was \$69.8 million including funds from the CGIAR Fund and other bilateral sources. Total execution in 2012 was \$67.6 million (including committed funds of \$4.2 million). Funding uncertainty was much reduced in 2012 given that the budget allocation from the Consortium was confirmed during the first quarter of 2012 whilst in 2011 it only happened late in the year. A financial crisis at one of the Centers made it necessary for the Fund to temporarily stop payments, which slowed down the implementation and resulted in high amounts of committed funds. CCAFS is expecting confirmation from the Consortium in order to be able to carry over these funds (\$4.2 million) into 2013 without affecting the 2013 Window 1 & Window 2 (W1&W2) allocation. The first tranche of W&W2 2012 funds (25%) was received early in May 2012. Thereafter, several other disbursements were received, amounting to 93% of the total 2012 W1&W2 budget.

10.2 2013 budget

The W1&W2 budget from the Consortium is yet to be confirmed. In October 2012 CCAFS was given a likely total budget figure for W1&W2 (90% of expenditure in 2012), but since the year-end execution was yet uncertain in October and it was not clear what the base will be for the Consortium to calculate the 90% expenditure, CCAFS assumed 90% execution of the 2012 allocated budget (\$41.4 million), which equals to \$37.26 million. It is yet to be confirmed what the base will be for the Consortium to calculate the 90% execution. It is possible that they factor in total execution including funds carried over from 2011, which means the base will be much higher than what was initially assumed; therefore more funds could be made available in 2013. Current total budget is \$62.1 million, including \$24.8 million from bilateral sources and from previous Challenge Program funds and excluding the 2012 W1&W2 carried over funds. Since CCAFS had to return to Centers to revise their initial budget submissions there are some differences between the budget presented in the Business Plan and the actual budget. It should be noted that there's been an increase of \$5.3 million bilateral funds compared to the budget in the Business Plan.

10.3 Financial update 2013

A brief summary on the 2013 cash flow was provided. As of April 20th, no 2013 funds have yet been received from the Consortium.

10.4 Financial outlook to 2014

There are no details on what the new outcome-based budgeting system in 2014 will be, but CCAFS was asked to be one of the CRPs that will trial the new system. It is unclear what materials that CCAFS has to assemble for this, and how this will interface with the need to develop a new proposal for phase 2 of CCAFS.

Decisions:

- To note the 2012 year end results and status of 2013 budget.
- To note that the planning processes for 2014 are unclear, given there is insufficient information on the proposed Consortium-led trial of the outcome-based budgeting system.
- To express concern that the budget for partnerships appears to be decreasing.
- To request that future budget presentations place greater focus on presenting information that can be used to assess whether CCAFS is implementing its strategy appropriately (e.g. in terms of partnerships, gender strategy).

11) Prioritization of items for the coming ISP meetings

The Program Director said that a large number of topics have been suggested as possible future agenda items, and there is thus a need to identify the topics of highest priority for discussion.

Topics previously identified are as follows:

1. "Mobilizing effective partnerships" ... "an assessment of partnerships to ensure that the selection is based on strategic considerations driven by the CCAFS agenda noting the need for academic and research partnerships with institutions also in the target regions"
2. "Scope and depth of engagement with the private sector"
3. "Review of progress towards desired impacts and outcomes"
4. Several research areas received additional investments, and it was suggested they be evaluated at future ISP meetings. The following have yet to be considered at an ISP meeting:
 - a. Adaptation strategies for agricultural and food systems into policy and institutional frameworks (Theme 1, Objective 3)
 - b. Climate Information services (Theme 2, Objective 3)
 - c. Institutions and incentives for pro-poor mitigation (Theme 3, Objective 1)
 - d. Process and tools needed to improve national level decisions
 - e. Gender analysis

A review of progress towards desired impacts and outcomes is probably not desirable at this stage, given the new IDO process that is being initiated. In addition, a partial review of this will take place through the ISP-commissioned external review.

The PMC believes that good progress is being made with climate information services so this is not a high priority.

Given the focus on gender in the CGIAR it is timely to have a future ISP agenda item on this, though it is suggested that this take place at the May 2014 meeting, thus allowing one more year of implementation.

A partnership and a private sector review is timely, so these could be prioritized for the October 2013 meeting.

Of the remaining topics, it was suggested that “Adaptation strategies for agricultural and food systems into policy and institutional frameworks” and “Process and tools needed to improve national level decisions” should be tackled in the October 2013 meeting, while “Institutions and incentives for pro-poor mitigation” can be tackled in the May 2014 meeting in Latin America, a region selected partly because of higher mitigation potential.

Decisions:

- To agree that the following topics be prioritized for October 2013 meeting:
 - Mobilizing effective partnerships
 - Scope and depth of engagement with strategic non-research partners, including the private sector
 - Adaptation strategies for agricultural and food systems into policy and institutional frameworks (Theme 1, Objective 3), including prioritisation tools for improving national level decision making
 - Focus in CCAFS phase 2 on smallholder farmers
 - Interaction between agriculture and climate change as a programmatic issue
 - Functionality of the ISP
- To agree that the following topics be prioritised for the May 2014 meeting:
 - Institutions and incentives for pro-poor mitigation (Theme 3, Objective 1)
 - Progress in the implementation of the gender strategy
 - Monitoring of the Data Management Strategy

12) Discussion of new ISP members (confidential)

13) Future meetings, inc. date and place for the 6th and 7th ISP meetings

It had been decided to hold the 5th ISP meeting on 10-11 October 2013 in Rome and organize meetings with Rome based agencies on 9 October. Based on Doodle feedback from ISP members, it had been proposed to hold the 6th ISP meeting on 19-20 May 2014 in Nicaragua, and to organize a field trip for those members available on 21 May. It was proposed to hold the 7th meeting in October 2014 in Washington DC.

Decisions:

- To confirm that the 5th meeting will be held in Rome on 10-11 October 2013, and that meetings will be organized with Rome based agencies on 9 October, taking note also of possible meetings with Bioversity.
- To hold the 6th meeting on 19-20 May 2014 in Nicaragua with a field trip on 21 May.
- To hold the 7th meeting in October 2014 in Washington DC, and to ask the Coordinating Unit to follow up with a Doodle for the precise dates.

14) ISP self-assessment

As per the the annual timeline for the CCAFS ISP, the self-assessment form was discussed. It probes a member's level of satisfaction with the current performance of the ISP, compared with that member's expectation of desired ISP performance. At the end of each section, ISP members are asked to suggest actions the ISP could take to improve its performance in the area of that specific ISP responsibility.

The ISP Vice-Chair is assigned responsibility to collate, summarize and analyze the results (with the assistance of the Coordinating Unit), for discussion at the next meeting. The Vice-Chair reminded the members about the decision at the last meeting to include in the self-assessment form a question on the functioning and competence of the ISP.

Decisions:

- To request that members return the forms by 28 May 2013 to the Vice-Chair.
- To ask the Vice-Chair to collect the results from the self-assessment forms and present the results at the ISP meeting in October 2013.

15) Evaluation of the current meeting

ISP members evaluated the current meeting for reasons of internal learning and efficiency of future meetings. Overall members were satisfied with the meeting, including preparations. The quality of the discussions was high, and the meeting was well managed. The following issues were highlighted for future meetings:

- Meetings should be at least two full days.
- Important to get the problems on the agenda for which the PMC wants the ISP guidance.
- Dinners and bus ride for field trip can be used for work purposes.
- Important to keep balance between science and governance topics.
- ISP members could be engaged more between meetings, e.g. using networks or for extension.
- A calendar with key activities for the next 12 months should be included for the meetings.

Decisions:

- To note comments and suggestions, and to ask the Coordinating Unit to ensure follow-ups and changes for future meetings.

16) Any other business

There were no other business.

17) Closed meeting without management**18) Closed meeting without management and Chair**
